

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,158	03/25/2004	Pelegrin Torres JR.	PD-203061	7382
20991	7590 08/23/2006		EXAMINER	
	CTV GROUP INC	SIPOS, JOHN		
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109 P O BOX 956			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			3721	
	·		DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/809,158	TORRES, PELEGRIN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John Sipos	3721				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ju	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2006					
_						
<i>'</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>14-35</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/25/06. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/25/06. Solution (PTO-152) Other:						
S. Patent and Trademark Office						

Art Unit 3721

Claims 14-35 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on July 25, 2006.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS BASED ON PRIOR ART

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. '103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) of pages 1-3 of the instant specification in view of the patent to Limelette (6,899,276). The APA comprises the placing of a Smart Card having a bar code in an envelope that is preprinted with a license agreement and then sealing the envelope. The envelope has a window that makes the bar code visible without opening the envelope. The opening of the preprinted envelope indicates acceptance of the agreement by the customer. This APA lacks the use of a film for the packaging. The patent to Limelette shows the wrapping of a data-encoded card in a polypropylene film that comprises a window portion to provide visibility of the card. It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art to use a film to package the Smart Card of the APA instead of the paper envelope to form a cheaper and a more easily mass-produced package.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, the presence of the print on both the front and the back of the package depends merely on the size of the license agreement and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to extend the agreement on both faces of the package if it is too large for the size of one side of the package.

The specific size of the card and film (claims 4,5 and 13) are matters of experimentation as to the most efficient and optimum package.

The use of film wrapped packages with spines is well known in the art and the Examiner takes official notice that the use of such spines is common knowledge in the packaging art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use spines to provide for easier access and grasping of the package.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES CITED

The cited prior art is made of record but has not been relied upon in the rejection of claims. However, the prior art is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit 3721

The patent to Lakso and Denison show packages with spines.

The other cited references show packaging of data cards.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Examiner John Sipos** at telephone number **571-272-4468**. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at **571-272-4467**.

The FAX number for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is (571) 273-8300.

Primary Examine